IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS TYLER DIVISION

| EDWARD CHARLES BOONE | § | |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Plaintiff, | § | |
| | § | |
| v. | § | CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:08-cv-23 |
| | § | |
| TELCO PLUS CREDIT UNION, | § | |
| DIANE HOLLIS, BETTY DEWEESE, | § | |
| GLADYS HERBERGER, TED | § | |
| SATTERWHITE, DON LLOYD, | § | |
| RUSSELL POLLICK, TIM | § | |
| WALLACE, CHRISTINA PRUITT, | § | |
| DAVID DOW, and BETSY LOAR, | § | |
| Defendants. | § | |

ORDER OVERRULING OBJECTIONS AND ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE

The above entitled and numbered civil action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge John D. Love pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. The Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Doc. No. 40) has been presented for consideration, which contains his proposed findings of fact and recommendations for the disposition of the following motions: Defendants Telco Plus Credit Union, Diane Hollis, Betty DeWeese, and Gladys Herberger's Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction and Failure to State a Claim (Doc. No. 20), Defendants Ted Satterwhite, Don Lloyd, Russell Pollick, Tim Wallace, Christina Pruitt, and David Dow's Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction and Failure to State a Claim (Doc. No. 21), and Defendant Betsy Loar's Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction and Failure to State a Claim (Doc. No. 22). Plaintiff Edward Charles Boone has filed an Objection (Doc. No. 44) to the Report and Recommendation. Plaintiff has also filed an Objection (Doc. No. 45) to the Magistrate Judge's Order (Doc. No. 42) denying Plaintiff's Motion to Compel and Motion for a

Hearing.

Having carefully considered the objections raised by Plaintiff, the Court is of the opinion that

the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge are correct. Federal Courts are courts of limited

jurisdiction. Plaintiff has not alleged that his claim arises out of the U.S. Constitution, a specific

federal statute, or any U.S. treaty. As discussed in the Magistrate Judge's Report, Plaintiff appears

to allege that he is the victim of fraudulent behavior involving financial institutions and financial

instruments. Private disputes of this nature, however, are generally governed by state law, not

federal law. See Christakes v. Burnhart, 1997 WL 94740, at *1 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 28, 1997). Plaintiff

must bring this type of action in a state court, not a federal court. Therefore, the Court hereby

overrules the objection of Plaintiff (Doc. No. 44) to the Report and Recommendation and adopts the

Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge as the findings of this Court.

Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that all of Defendants' Motions to Dismiss (Doc. Nos.

20, 21, 22) be **GRANTED** and that Plaintiff Edward Charles Boone's Complaint be **DISMISSED**.

Furthermore, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that discovery and the subpoena of

documents would be premature at this stage of the proceedings. Therefore, the Court hereby

OVERRULES the objection of Plaintiff (Doc. No. 45) to the Magistrate Judge's Order (Doc. No.

42) denying Plaintiff's Motion to Compel and Motion for a Hearing.

SIGNED this 15th day of August, 2008.

MICHAEL H. SCHNEIDER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

ne Ukhni Da